

MD 94-19
11-15-93

DOCKET FILE COPY OF 201A

Sec of the FCC

RECEIVED

NOV 18 1993

Dear Sir:

FCC MAIL ROOM

Why do you think imposing a "use fee" of \$7.00 per year for a VHF Radio License will promote Safety? The biggest problem you (we) have today is unregistered operators of VHF Marine Radios, primarily because of the fees you charge now. Only the Safety conscious will pay and that is not who you are looking to improve on safety. WAKE UP!!

Philip Ferguson

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

MD 94-19

RECEIVED

NOV 18 1993

11-15-93

FCC MAIL ROOM

Sir:

Comment:

DO NOT FILE ORIGINAL

The new \$7.00 a yr
extra fee, is one of the
worst thing that can
happen; you are taking
on the safety of a lot
of people.

We would do away with
are VHF marine radio.

Thank you
John S. Robert
David W. Robert

P.S.

\$35.00 is enough.

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

0

DOCKET FILE COPY OF ORIGINAL

MD 94-19)
RECEIVED

NOV 18 1993

FCC MAIL ROOM

14913 Keeneland Circle
N. Potomac, MD 20878

November 15, 1993

Secretary of the FCC
c/o Office of the Managing Director
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Sir:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to your proposal to charge a \$7 annual "user fee" to holders of Marine VHF radio licenses. This would be in addition to the \$35 already charged for renewal for each five year period.

The primary purpose of the Marine VHF radio is safety. It is the only reliable way to contact the U.S. Coast Guard or other authorities in the event of an emergency. This ill founded and unreasonable fee will simply make it less likely that recreational boaters will be able to have a VHF radio available, placing lives and property at risk.

Our Federal Government continues under the erroneous and unfortunate misconception that boaters are wealthy "fat cats" who can and should be taxed to extinction. The truth is that the overwhelming majority of boaters are middle class who have chosen boating as a wholesome family recreational activity. The folly of over-taxing boaters has been demonstrated with the repeal of the luxury tax and federal user fee after it became clear how damaging these taxes were to all of those who depend on the recreational boating industry for their livelihood. I believe that your proposed annual "user fee" is fundamentally unfair and will result in a reduction in the availability of VHF Marine radios and the critical ability of recreational boaters to summon help in an emergency.

Sincerely,

Richard S. Schifreen

Richard S. Schifreen

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

8

MD 94-15

RECEIVED

NOV 18 1991

FCC MAIL ROOM

Secretary of the FCC
% Office of Managing Director
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M St NW
Washington D.C. 20554

Subject: VHF

According to Broff/US FIC, Professor
to attempt to cover an area 3500
over and above the 35 license and to
call the change a "user fee" for VHF.

Following in the footsteps of the radio
of the "user fee" which had to be
withstand the proposed fee was for "well
no doubt strong financial pressure
and opposition. Finally the concept to an
market was introduced. He no longer VHF
are shared the old and partly unenforceable.
Secondly, the VHF is a really a low price as
the fee is insignificant. The fee group - like
not etc are and it discourages the
ability to communicate through radio
at any frequency. The payment of the fee
is "user fee" for the using equipment as not
in the public interest.

Michael J. Finkler
1/3 November 1992
No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE
Box 85
Marblehead Mass
02738